

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

					mt
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/141,443	08/27/9	8 WALEH		А	D-95013A
			7	EXAMINER	
		IM22/0703	•		
DAIVD W COLLINS				MARKOFF.A	
75 WEST CALLE DE LAS TIENDAS SUITE 125B				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREEN VALLEY AZ 85614					13
				1746	
				DATE MAILED:	
					07/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

i a		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/141,443	WALEH ET AL.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexander Markoff	1746
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2001 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a th places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check only a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within the reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR of whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory per mailing date of the final rejection. 	wo months as set forth in MPEP \S 706.07 (continues to run from the mailing date of the	final rejection,
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The distance been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the distance of the distance of the distance of the correction and the	fee. The appropriate extension fee under ne final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon with requisite fees.	n the timely submission of a Notic	ce of Appeal and Appeal Brief
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered I	pecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note	e below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		idered but does NOT place the
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s)	is as follows (see attached writte	n explanation, if any):
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-23 and 25-31</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
9. The proposed drawing correction filed on	a) ☐has b) ☐ has not been appr	oved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	: 1 / ///
11. ☐ Other:		Mera Mill
ALEXANDER PRIMARY E	MARKOFF XAMINER	Alexander Markoff Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1746





Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Applicants proposed to amend the claims to specify that UV radiation is used (claims 11, 14, 18, 20 and 29), to delete recitation of ceramic devices from claim 31, to specify organic polymers in claim 31. These amendments raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants rely on the proposed amendments in their arguments. However, the proposed amendment would not be entered because of the reasons given above.